

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Offic

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. **FILING DATE** FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 09/781,427 02/13/01 STEINER 22789XA-T **EXAMINER** HM12/0917 COOK. R GARY M. NATH PAPER NUMBER **ART UNIT** NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC 6TH FLOOR 1614 1030 15TH STREET, N. W. **DATE MAILED:** WASHINGTON DC 20005 09/17/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/781,427

Applicant(s)

Steiner et al

Examiner

Rebecca Cook

Art Unit **1614** 



The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
Period :	for Reply	
THE	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	<del></del>
af	ter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic	FR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed cation.  a, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will
	considered timely.  Described for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory.	period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this
cc - Failur - Any	ommunication. re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by	y statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). a mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
Status	,	
1) 🗌	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	
2a) 🗌	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) 💢 This act	tion is non-final.
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pa	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is arte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposi	tion of Claims	
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>11-20</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4	4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) 💢	Claim(s) <u>11-20</u>	is/are rejected.
7) 🗌	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) 🗆	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Applica	ation Papers	
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	•
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	e objected to by the Examiner.
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) □ approved b) □ disapproved.
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	iner.
13)□	under 35 U.S.C. § 119  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p $\Box$ All b) $\Box$ Some* c) $\Box$ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
<b>a</b> , ∟	1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have	ve heen received
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have	
		locuments have been received in this National Stage
*S	application from the International Bure ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
14)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
Attachm	nent(s)	
15) 💢 N	lotice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
17) 💢 Ir	nformation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	20) Other:

Application/Control Number: 09/781,427 Page 2

Art Unit: 1614

Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

There is no support in the specification for substituting the ester or amide at any carbon in the heterocyclic compound. They are all substituted at the C-2 position.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for some of the compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for rapamycin. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. To the extent that intended use of a composition is patentable CA122:230322 discloses that rapamycin does not initiate hair growth.

Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is no antecedent basis in claim 11 for the recitation in claims 11, 16-19 "a second hair revitalizing agent."

There is no antecedent basis in claim 11 for the recitation in claims 12-15, 20 "pipecolic acid derivative."

There is no antecedent basis in claim 11 for the recitations "heterocyclic ring."

Art Unit: 1614

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CA128:43577.

The reference discloses that a FK506, a compound meeting the description of the compound of claim 11, promotes hair growth.

The instant claims differ over the reference in reciting a composition combined with a second agent that promotes hair growth.

However, in the absence of a showing of unexpected results in Declaration form it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine two compounds, each of which promote hair growth, in a composition. One would be motivated by the desire to increase the amount of hair growth.

Applicants are requested to cite any prior art or other considerations used in drafting the proviso.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed.

Application/Control Number: 09/781,427

Art Unit: 1614

Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 11 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5-6 of copending Application No. 09/784,174. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claim is obvious when the compound of '174 is an N-linked ketone.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicants are requested to identify applications in which there are conflicting claims and eliminate such claims from all but one application in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. See CFR 1.78(b).

Application/Control Number: 09/781,427 Page 5

Art Unit: 1614

Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822. Applicants are also requested to identify any related cases in which there might be double patenting.

Steiner, CA 126:272710; Blaschke et al, 1974, CA85:78405k; Nicolaou et al, Am. Chem. Soc., 1993; Nicolaou et al, Che. Eur. J.,1995; Shu et al, J. Labelled Comp. Radiopharm., 1996; Smith, et al, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1995; Soai et al, J. Chem. Soc. 1982; Waldmann, Synlett, 1990; Waldmann, Liebigs Ann. Chem, 1991; and Wasserman et al, J. Org. Chem., 54(22), 1989 could not be considered. They were not received.

The foreign language references were considered to the extent of their English language abstracts or their formulas. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Cook whose telephone number is (703) 308-4724. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel, can be reached on (703) 308-4725. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

REBECCA COOK PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1200

September 11, 2001